

Algebraic Bethe ansatz for a singular solution

Rafael I. Nepomechie ¹ and Chunguang Wang ²

Physics Department, P.O. Box 248046, University of Miami

Coral Gables, FL 33124 USA

Abstract

The Bethe equations for the spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain with N sites have a “two-string” solution $\pm i/2$ that is singular: both the corresponding energy and algebraic Bethe ansatz vector are divergent. We show that this solution must be carefully regularized in order to obtain the correct eigenvector. This regularization involves a parameter that can be determined using a generalization of the Bethe equations. It follows that this solution must be excluded for odd N .

¹nepomechie@physics.miami.edu

²c.wang22@umiami.edu

1 Introduction

It is well known that the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg quantum spin chain with N sites, with Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{n=1}^N (\vec{\sigma}_n \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{n+1} - 1), \quad \vec{\sigma}_{N+1} \equiv \vec{\sigma}_1, \quad (1)$$

can be solved by algebraic Bethe ansatz (ABA): the eigenvalues are given by

$$E = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{\lambda_k^2 + \frac{1}{4}}, \quad (2)$$

and the corresponding $su(2)$ highest-weight eigenvectors are given by the Bethe vectors

$$|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M\rangle = B(\lambda_1) \cdots B(\lambda_M) |0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M\}$ are solutions of the Bethe equations

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_k + \frac{i}{2}}{\lambda_k - \frac{i}{2}} \right)^N = \prod_{\substack{j \neq k \\ j=1}}^M \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_j + i}{\lambda_k - \lambda_j - i}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M, \quad (4)$$

and $M = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{N}{2}$. The spin s of the state is given by $s = \frac{N}{2} - M$. (See, for example, [1, 2].)

It is also well known that the so-called two-string $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (\frac{i}{2}, -\frac{i}{2})$ is an *exact* solution of the Bethe equations for $N \geq 4$.¹ This solution is singular, as both the corresponding energy (2) and Bethe vector (3) are divergent. Clearly, it is necessary to regularize this solution. The naive regularization

$$\lambda_1^{naive} = \frac{i}{2} + \epsilon, \quad \lambda_2^{naive} = -\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon \quad (6)$$

gives the correct value of the energy in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, namely, $E = -1$.

What is perhaps not so well known is that this naive regularization gives a wrong result for the eigenvector.² Indeed, the vector $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\lambda_1^{naive}, \lambda_2^{naive}\rangle$ is finite, but it is *not* an eigenvector of the Hamiltonian! For example, in the case $N = 4$, we easily find with **Mathematica** that³

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\lambda_1^{naive}, \lambda_2^{naive}\rangle = (0, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, -2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0), \quad (7)$$

¹This fact is particularly easy to see from the Bethe equations in the pole-free form

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_1 + \frac{i}{2})^N (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - i) &= (\lambda_1 - \frac{i}{2})^N (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + i), \\ (\lambda_2 + \frac{i}{2})^N (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 - i) &= (\lambda_2 - \frac{i}{2})^N (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 + i). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

General two-string solutions were considered in detail in [3].

²Difficulties with constructing the eigenvector corresponding to the Bethe roots $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ were already noted in [4, 5].

³Our conventions are specified in Section 2 below.

while the correct eigenvector with $E = -1$ and $s = 0$ is known to be instead

$$(0, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, -2, 0, 0, -2, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0) . \quad (8)$$

We further observe that, for general values of N , the correct eigenvector can be obtained within the ABA approach by introducing a suitable additional correction of order ϵ^N to the Bethe roots:⁴

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{i}{2} + \epsilon + c\epsilon^N, \quad \lambda_2 = -\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon, \quad (9)$$

where the parameter c is independent of ϵ . Returning to the example of $N = 4$, we find

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |\lambda_1, \lambda_2\rangle = (0, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, -2, 0, 0, ic, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0) . \quad (10)$$

Comparing with (8), we see that the requisite value of the parameter in this case is $c = 2i$.

In the next section of this note, we address the question of how to determine in a systematic way the parameter c in (9), which (as we have already seen) is necessary for obtaining the correct eigenvector. Clearly, it is not a matter of simply solving the Bethe equations (4), since they are not satisfied by (9) for ϵ finite. Indeed, we shall find that the Bethe equations themselves acquire ϵ -dependent corrections.

2 Determining the parameter

We begin by briefly establishing our conventions. Following [1], the R -matrix is given by

$$R_{a_1 a_2}(\lambda) = \lambda \mathbb{I}_{a_1 a_2} + i \mathcal{P}_{a_1 a_2}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are the 4×4 identity and permutation matrices, respectively. However, as explained below, we choose a different normalization for the Lax operator, namely,

$$L_{na}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(\lambda + \frac{i}{2})} \left[(\lambda - \frac{i}{2}) \mathbb{I}_{na} + i \mathcal{P}_{na} \right]. \quad (12)$$

As usual, the monodromy matrix is given by

$$T_a(\lambda) = L_{Na}(\lambda) \cdots L_{1a}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} A(\lambda) & B(\lambda) \\ C(\lambda) & D(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

and the transfer matrix is given by

$$t(\lambda) = \text{tr}_a T_a(\lambda) = A(\lambda) + D(\lambda). \quad (14)$$

The reference state is denoted by $|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes N}$.

⁴Such higher-order corrections of singular Bethe roots were already noted in Eq. (3.4) of [6]. See also [7, 8].

We next recall the action of the transfer matrix on an off-shell Bethe vector (3) [1]

$$t(\lambda)|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M\rangle = \Lambda(\lambda)|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M\rangle + \sum_{k=1}^M F_k(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) B(\lambda_1) \cdots \widehat{B}(\lambda_k) \cdots B(\lambda_M) B(\lambda)|0\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where a hat is used to denote a term that is omitted, and

$$\Lambda(\lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^M \left(\frac{\lambda - \lambda_j - i}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \right) + \left(\frac{\lambda - \frac{i}{2}}{\lambda + \frac{i}{2}} \right)^N \prod_{j=1}^M \left(\frac{\lambda - \lambda_j + i}{\lambda - \lambda_j} \right), \quad (16)$$

$$F_k(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) = \frac{i}{\lambda - \lambda_k} \left[\prod_{j \neq k}^M \left(\frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_j - i}{\lambda_k - \lambda_j} \right) - \left(\frac{\lambda_k - \frac{i}{2}}{\lambda_k + \frac{i}{2}} \right)^N \prod_{j \neq k}^M \left(\frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_j + i}{\lambda_k - \lambda_j} \right) \right]. \quad (17)$$

The Bethe equations (4) are precisely the conditions $F_k(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) = 0$, which ensure that the “unwanted” terms vanish, and hence, the Bethe vector $|\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M\rangle$ is an eigenvector of the transfer matrix. In particular, for $M = 2$, the relation (15) reduces to

$$t(\lambda)|\lambda_1, \lambda_2\rangle = \Lambda(\lambda)|\lambda_1, \lambda_2\rangle + F_1(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) B(\lambda_2) B(\lambda)|0\rangle + F_2(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) B(\lambda_1) B(\lambda)|0\rangle, \quad (18)$$

which holds for generic values of λ, λ_1 and λ_2 .

Let us now focus on the special case of the two-string solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$. As already mentioned in the Introduction, the corresponding Bethe vector $|\frac{i}{2}, -\frac{i}{2}\rangle$ is singular: some of its components have the form $0/0$. (If we had defined the Lax operator (12) without dividing by $(\lambda + \frac{i}{2})$ as in [1], then the corresponding Bethe vector would instead be *null* [4].) In particular, the creation operator $B(\frac{i}{2})$ is finite, but $B(-\frac{i}{2})$ is singular.

Let us first consider the naive regularization (6). The key observation is that, for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the most singular matrix elements of $B(\lambda_2^{naive})$ are of order $\frac{1}{\epsilon^N}$. (See (29).) It follows from the off-shell relation (18) that, for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, F_1 and F_2 must satisfy

$$F_1(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) \sim \epsilon^{N+1}, \quad F_2(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) \sim \epsilon, \quad (19)$$

in order that the Bethe vector be an eigenvector of the transfer matrix. However, explicit computation using (6) shows that $F_1(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) \sim \epsilon^N$ (instead of ϵ^{N+1}) and $F_2(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) \sim 1$ (instead of ϵ). Hence, the “unwanted” terms are finite (do not vanish), which explains why the corresponding Bethe vector is not an eigenvector.⁵

Let us therefore consider the regularization (9). The leading behavior of $B(\lambda_1)$ and $B(\lambda_2)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ remains the same; hence, the conditions (19) must still be satisfied to ensure that the Bethe vector is an eigenvector of the transfer matrix. Explicit computation using (9) gives

$$F_1(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) = \left(\frac{c + 2i^{-(N+1)}}{\lambda - \frac{i}{2}} \right) \epsilon^N + O(\epsilon^{N+1}), \quad F_2(\lambda, \{\lambda\}) = \left(\frac{2i - i^{-N}c}{\lambda + \frac{i}{2}} \right) + O(\epsilon). \quad (20)$$

⁵The fact that $B(\lambda_2^{naive})$ has matrix elements of order $\frac{1}{\epsilon^N}$ suggests that $|\lambda_1^{naive}, \lambda_2^{naive}\rangle \sim \frac{1}{\epsilon^N}$. However, as shown in the Appendix, this vector is finite for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For even N , both conditions (19) can be satisfied by setting

$$c = 2i(-1)^{N/2}, \quad (21)$$

which reproduces our earlier result for $N = 4$. We have also explicitly verified that, for $N = 6$, the ABA Bethe vector constructed using (9) and (21) is indeed an eigenvector of the Hamiltonian.⁶ Interestingly, the two conditions (19) cannot be simultaneously satisfied for odd N , implying that the two-string $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ is *not* a bona fide solution for odd N .⁷

We note that the regularization (9) is not unique. Indeed, we can introduce a two-parameter regularization

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{i}{2} + \epsilon + c_1 \epsilon^N, \quad \lambda_2 = -\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon + c_2 \epsilon^N. \quad (22)$$

The conditions (19) now imply (for even N) that

$$c_1 - c_2 = 2i(-1)^{N/2}. \quad (23)$$

For finite ϵ , the corresponding energy (2) depends only on the difference $c_1 - c_2$. If we impose the additional constraint $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2^*$ [9], then we obtain $c_1 = c_2^* = i(-1)^{N/2}$. In short, a regularization of the singular solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ that produces the correct eigenvector in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, and also satisfies $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2^*$, is given (for even N) by

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{i}{2} + \epsilon + i(-1)^{N/2} \epsilon^N, \quad \lambda_2 = -\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon - i(-1)^{N/2} \epsilon^N. \quad (24)$$

3 Conclusion

We have seen that the ABA must be extended for the two-string solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ of the Bethe equations. Indeed, this solution must be carefully regularized as in (9) or (22) in order to obtain the correct eigenvector. This regularization involves a parameter that can be determined using a generalization of the Bethe equations given by (19), where F_k is defined in (17). A consequence of this analysis is that the solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ must be excluded for odd N .

It would be interesting to know whether the finite- ϵ corrections to the energy have any physical significance. We expect that our analysis can be extended to the anisotropic case, and that a similar approach may be needed to construct the eigenvectors corresponding to more complicated configurations of singular Bethe roots.

Note Added

After completing this work, we became aware of [10], where similar results were obtained for the solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$. However, our approach differs significantly from theirs.

⁶It was claimed in [5] that the Bethe ansatz fails for this case.

⁷For $N = 5$, the Clebsch-Gordan theorem implies that there are five highest-weight eigenvectors with $s = \frac{1}{2}$; and we have explicitly verified that all of these eigenvectors can be constructed with Bethe roots other than $\pm \frac{i}{2}$, thereby directly proving that the solution $\pm \frac{i}{2}$ must be discarded.

Acknowledgments

We thank Omar Foda and Michael Wheeler for helpful correspondence, and Vladimir Korepin for reading a draft. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant PHY-1212337 and by a Cooper fellowship.

A Appendix

Here we fill in some details. It is convenient to define an unrenormalized Lax operator (as in [1]):

$$\tilde{L}_{na}(\lambda) = (\lambda - \frac{i}{2})\mathbb{I}_{na} + i\mathcal{P}_{na}, \quad (25)$$

and correspondingly

$$\tilde{T}_a(\lambda) = \tilde{L}_{Na}(\lambda) \cdots \tilde{L}_{1a}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}(\lambda) & \tilde{B}(\lambda) \\ \tilde{C}(\lambda) & \tilde{D}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Evidently,

$$L_{na}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(\lambda + \frac{i}{2})} \tilde{L}_{na}(\lambda), \quad T_a(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(\lambda + \frac{i}{2})^N} \tilde{T}_a(\lambda). \quad (27)$$

In particular,

$$B(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(\lambda + \frac{i}{2})^N} \tilde{B}(\lambda). \quad (28)$$

Since $\tilde{B}(\pm \frac{i}{2})$ are finite, it follows that $B(\frac{i}{2})$ is also finite, and

$$B(-\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon) \sim \frac{1}{\epsilon^N} \quad (29)$$

plus less singular terms.

The fact (29) suggests that $|\lambda_1^{naive}, \lambda_2^{naive}\rangle = B(\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon) B(-\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon)|0\rangle$ should be similarly divergent for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. However, we shall now argue that this vector is in fact finite. In view of (28), it suffices to show that⁸

$$\tilde{B}(\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon) \tilde{B}(-\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon)|0\rangle \sim \epsilon^N. \quad (30)$$

To this end, we proceed by induction. The behavior (30) can be easily verified explicitly for $N = 4$ using **Mathematica**. We observe from (26) that the monodromy matrices for $N - 1$ and N sites are related by

$$\tilde{T}_a^{(N)}(\lambda) = \tilde{L}_{Na}(\lambda) \tilde{T}_a^{(N-1)}(\lambda), \quad (31)$$

⁸The result (30) implies, as already noted, that this vector is null in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

which implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}^{(N)}(\lambda) & \tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda) \\ \tilde{C}^{(N)}(\lambda) & \tilde{D}^{(N)}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{a}_N(\lambda) & \tilde{b}_N(\lambda) \\ \tilde{c}_N(\lambda) & \tilde{d}_N(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}^{(N-1)}(\lambda) & \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda) \\ \tilde{C}^{(N-1)}(\lambda) & \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_N(\lambda) &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + \frac{i}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda - \frac{i}{2} \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{b}_N(\lambda) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \tilde{c}_N(\lambda) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \tilde{d}_N(\lambda) &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda - \frac{i}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda + \frac{i}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

In particular,

$$\tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda) = \tilde{a}_N(\lambda) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda) + \tilde{b}_N(\lambda) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda). \quad (34)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda_2) |0\rangle^{(N)} &= \left[\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) + \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \right] \\ &\times \left[\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) + \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \right] |0\rangle^{(N-1)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N \\ &= \left[\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \right. \\ &\quad + \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \\ &\quad + \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \right] |0\rangle^{(N-1)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

for λ_1, λ_2 arbitrary.

We now set $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1^{naive} = \frac{i}{2} + \epsilon$ and $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{naive} = -\frac{i}{2} + \epsilon$, and we consider the four terms on the RHS of (35), starting with the first: by the induction hypothesis,

$$\tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) |0\rangle^{(N-1)} \sim \epsilon^{N-1}. \quad (36)$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N \sim \epsilon. \quad (37)$$

Hence, the first term on the RHS of (35) is of order ϵ^N .

The fourth term on the RHS of (35) is zero because

$$\tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N = 0. \quad (38)$$

Using the exchange relation [1]

$$\tilde{D}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}(\lambda_2) = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + i}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \tilde{B}(\lambda_2) \tilde{D}(\lambda_1) - \frac{i}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} \tilde{B}(\lambda_1) \tilde{D}(\lambda_2) \quad (39)$$

in the third term, we see that the second and third terms on the RHS of (35) combine to give

$$\left\{ \left[\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) - \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \right] \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) + 2\tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \tilde{B}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_2) \tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) \right\} |0\rangle^{(N-1)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N \quad (40)$$

The first line of (40) gives a vanishing contribution because

$$\left[\tilde{a}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_2) - \tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N = 0. \quad (41)$$

The second line of (40) is of order ϵ^N , since

$$\tilde{D}^{(N-1)}(\lambda_1) |0\rangle^{(N-1)} \sim \epsilon^{N-1}, \quad (42)$$

and

$$\tilde{b}_N(\lambda_1) \tilde{a}_N(\lambda_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_N \sim \epsilon. \quad (43)$$

In short, we have shown that

$$\tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda_1) \tilde{B}^{(N)}(\lambda_2) |0\rangle^{(N)} \sim \epsilon^N, \quad (44)$$

which concludes the inductive proof of our claim (30).

References

- [1] L. Faddeev, “How algebraic Bethe ansatz works for integrable model,” [arXiv:hep-th/9605187](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [2] V. Korepin, N. Bogoliubov, and A. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Method and Correlation Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [3] F. H. Essler, V. E. Korepin, and K. Schoutens, “Fine structure of the Bethe ansatz for the spin 1/2 Heisenberg XXX model,” *J.Phys.* **A25** (1992) 4115–4126.
- [4] R. Siddharthan, “Singularities in the Bethe solution of the XXX and XXZ Heisenberg spin chains,” [arXiv:cond-mat/9804210](#) [[cond-mat](#)].

- [5] A. Wal, T. Lulek, B. Lulek, and E. Kozak, “The Heisenberg magnetic ring with 6 nodes: exact diagonalization, Bethe ansatz and string configurations,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **13** (1999) 3307.
- [6] N. Beisert, J. A. Minahan, M. Staudacher, and K. Zarembo, “Stringing spins and spinning strings,” *JHEP* **09** (2003) 010, [arXiv:hep-th/0306139](#).
- [7] N. Beisert, V. Dippel, and M. Staudacher, “A novel long range spin chain and planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang-Mills,” *JHEP* **07** (2004) 075, [arXiv:hep-th/0405001](#).
- [8] G. Arutyunov, S. Frolov, and A. Sfondrini, “Exceptional Operators in N=4 super Yang-Mills,” *JHEP* **1209** (2012) 006, [arXiv:1205.6660 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] A. Vladimirov, “Proof of the invariance of the Bethe-ansatz solutions under complex conjugation,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **66** (1986) 102.
- [10] L. Avdeev and A. Vladimirov, “Exceptional solutions of the Bethe ansatz equations,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **69** (1987) 1071.